UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,677	06/27/2001	Kent D. Cedola	50037.13US01	3958

27488 7590 01/22/2004		EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD		AL HASHEMI, SANA A	
P.O. BOX 2903			
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2171	

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td colspan="2">Application No.</td><td colspan="2">Applicant(s)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">09/892,677</td><td colspan="2">CEDOLA ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2">Examiner</td><td colspan="2">Art Unit</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2">Sana Al-Hashemi</td><td>2171</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 December 2003</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a)☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status: 1- 20 are rejected.

Applicant's arguments filed 12/2/2003 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Wu (US Patent No. 6,463,427).

1.   Regarding Claims 1, 11, and 18, Wu discloses a computer-readable medium

having computer-executable instructions for synchronizing data between a first data store

and a second data store (see Fig. 1, 3, and 4, Wu), comprising:

receiving from the second data store a request to synchronize data objects on the

second data store with data objects on the first data store (see column 6, lines 33-36, Wu);

determining whether a sync state table exists associated with the second data

store, the sync state table identifying the data objects on the second data store (see

column 6, lines 16-22, Wu);

if the sync state table does not exist, creating the sync state table to identify the

data objects on the second data store (see column 6, lines 37-40, Wu);

issuing a search request to the first data store; in response to the search request,

receiving a manifest of data objects on the first data store (see column 6, lines 22-31,

Wu);

and including in the sync state table any objects identified in the manifest with an

action other than a delete action (see column 6, lines 44-51, Wu).

2.   Regarding Claim 2, Wu discloses a method further comprising passing the altered

manifest including the add event to a mobile device on which resides the mobile data

store (see column 7, lines 53-64, Wu).

3.   Regarding Claim 3m Wu discloses a method wherein the altered manifest

includes modifications that describe add events, change events, and delete events (see

summary of the invention, column 2, lines 21-23, Wu).

4.   Regarding Claims 4, and 8, Wu discloses a method wherein the add events,

change events, and delete events describe actions to be performed on objects that reside

in the mobile data store (see Fig. 5, 6, Wu).

5.   Regarding Claim 5, Wu discloses a method wherein the manifest, prior to being

altered, does not contain a modification that describes an add event, and wherein the

altered manifest contains at least one modification that describes an add event (see

column 8, lines 21-26, Wu).

6.   Regarding Claim 9, Wu discloses a method wherein the request to synchronize

comprising a search request for objects on the data store that have changed since a prior

synchronization transaction between the data store and the mobile data store (see column 7, lines 27-36, Wu).

7.   Regarding Claim 10, Wu discloses a method wherein the request to synchronize comprises a search request for objects on the data store that have been deleted since a prior synchronization transaction between the data store and the mobile data store (see column 10, lines 4-7, Wu).

8.   Regarding Claim 12, Wu discloses a computer-readable medium further comprising including in the sync state table the object that was not in the sync state table (see column 8, lines 58-63, Wu).

9.   Regarding Claim 13, Wu discloses a computer-readable medium further comprising passing the manifest with the altered record to the second data store (see column 7, lines 21-26, Wu).

10.   Regarding Claim 14, Wu discloses a computer-readable medium further comprising passing the object that was not in the sync state table to the second data store (see column 8, lines 63-67, Wu).

11.   Regarding Claim 15, Wu discloses a computer-readable medium wherein the first data store and the second data store each contain copies of the collection of data objects (see column 3, lines 8-15, Wu).

12.   Regarding Claim 16, Wu discloses a computer-readable medium wherein the data objects comprise e-mail messages (see column 6, lines 45-48, Wu).

13.   Regarding Claim 17, Wu discloses a computer-readable medium wherein the data objects comprise contact information objects (see column 6, lines 48-51, Wu).

14.   Regarding Claim 19, Wu discloses a computer-readable medium further

comprising for any object identified in the manifest but which was not identified in the

sync state table, associating an add event in the manifest with those objects (see column

6, lines 52-58, Wu).

15.   Regarding Claim 20, Wu discloses a computer-readable medium further

comprising passing the manifest including the associated add events to the second data

store (see column 7, lines 27-32, Wu).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, and 7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wu in view of the Peiya liu

Regarding Claims 6, and 7 Wu does not discloses the method of the manifest is

created in accordance with a Document Authoring and Versioning (DAV) protocol.

However, the Siemens Corporate research teaches the method of the DAV protocol used

in manifest creation (see page 76-79, Peiya Liu), it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the DAV protocol to create and

modify the document with the motivation of keeping all the synchronized data updated

and categorized properly by creating new add events if needed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues "Wu does not discloses "altering the action associated with the

corresponding object to an add event" or "including in the sync state table any objects

identified in the manifest with an action other than a delete action"".

Examiner disagrees. Referring to column 6, lines 10-67, Wu teaches the method

of allowing the creation and updating of databases for different types of object which in

other words reads on altering action, since the system allow the user to creates and update

the databases.

Applicant argues Wu does not teach "passing the altered manifest including the

add event to a mobile device on which resides the mobile data store."

Examiner disagrees. Referring to column 7, lines 49-64, Wu teaches the step of

passing the signature, which is a new event add to the document.

Applicant argues "add events…[that] describe action to be performed on objects

that reside in the mobile data store" and Wu teaches synchronization of information

stored in objects stores on a desktop computer and a mobile device.

Examiner response if the data has been stored on a desktop and mobile device, the

limitation claimed has been met by the reference.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to: Sana Al-Hashemi whose telephone number is. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436. Any response to this office action should be mailed to: The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. Or telefax at phone number (703) 746-9098. For formal or draft communications, please label "PROSPOSED" or "DRAFT". Hand-delivered response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, 6th Floor Receptionist, Arlington, Virginia. 22202.

Sana Al-Hashemi
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
January 21, 2004

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100